

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

PACKET INTELLIGENCE LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

SANDVINE CORPORATION, and
SANDVINE INCORPORATED ULC

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:16-CV-00147

VERDICT FORM

In answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you in the Court's charge. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

As used herein:

- "The '725 Patent" refers to U.S. Patent No. 6,665,725;
- "The '751 Patent" refers to U.S. Patent No. 6,839,751;
- "The '789 Patent" refers to U.S. Patent No. 6,954,789.

These three patents are together sometimes referred to as "the Asserted Patents."

Claim 10 of the '725 Patent, Claims 1 and 5 of the '751 Patent, and Claim 19 of the '789 Patent are collectively referred to as "the Asserted Claims."

"Packet Intelligence" refers to Packet Intelligence LLC and "Sandvine" refers collectively to Sandvine Corporation and Sandvine Incorporated ULC.

QUESTION #1

Did Packet Intelligence prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Sandvine has infringed any of the Asserted Claims of the '725 Patent, the '751 Patent, or the '789 Patent?

Answer "YES" or "NO" in the space provided below.

Answer: No

QUESTION #2

ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO QUESTION 1.

What sum of money, if now paid in cash, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence would reasonably compensate Packet Intelligence for Sandvine's infringement through the expiration of any of the Asserted Patents which you have found to be infringed?

(Answer in U.S. Dollars)

Answer: \$ 0

Signed: _____
Jury Foreperson

Date: November 9, 2017